



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE SINGLE TAX AND THE IMPÔT UNIQUE.

I have read with interest, in the January and April numbers of this *Journal*, the two notes concerning myself. The point at issue was the filiation which I had felt authorized to establish between the system of Henry George and that of the Physiocrats, in an article in the *Political Science Quarterly*.

I am obliged to decide in favor of my critic, and, what I regret much more, to decide against Mr. Samuel B. Clarke, who has so kindly and courageously undertaken to justify me. No: it did not enter into my mind to undertake any assimilation of the doctrines of Henry George to those of the Physiocrats on the question of landed property. I know the system of Henry George very well, for I was the first, I believe, to bring it to notice in France, by an article published as long ago as May, 1883, in the *Journal des Économistes*; and your readers will do me the honor to believe that I also know the doctrine of my compatriots, the Physiocrats. I recognize fully that the two doctrines are not identical nor even reconcilable, since the Physiocrats see in the institution of landed property the basis of social order, while Mr. George sees in it the cause of all the evils which desolate society.

What, then, was my meaning? Nothing more than to establish in favor of the French economists a claim of priority upon a particular point,—nothing more than what Henry George himself says in the words which I have cited,—that the Physiocrats long before him had the idea of an *impôt unique* on the land; that, for them, as for him, this *impôt unique* (single tax) was founded on a right of the State as coproprietor, and was intended to constitute a sort of common patrimony of the nation; that for them, as for him, this *impôt unique* was to have for its result the suppression of all other taxes, and was thus to give a vigorous impulse to industry and commerce and to simplify prodigiously the budget of the State.

It is true that, while the Physiocrats used this weapon of the single tax to consolidate property, Henry George wishes to use it to destroy property. But what difference does this make? It is still the same weapon used for different ends.

To avoid all misunderstanding, I should have said simply this: the Physiocrats were "single-taxists," but they were not "Nationalists."

CHARLES GIDE.

MONTPELLIER, April, 1891.

---

### THE DRIVEN-WELL PATENT.

Mr. Chauncey Smith, in his very interesting article in the October number of this *Journal* entitled "A Century of Patent Law," is in error in reference to one statement about the driven well; and that is where he states that the fact that the well had been in public use more than two years before Green filed his application for a patent "was not known to the Patent Office while the application was pending."

When Green filed his application, two patents had already been granted,—one to Suggett, March 29, 1864, and one to Mudge, October 24, 1865. Mudge soon after applied for a reissue of his patent, which reissue was pending when Green's application was filed March 14, 1866; and, as a result, an interference was declared between all three. The testimony taken and filed in the Patent Office shows that Mudge put down the first well in September, 1861; that he put down another for a Mr. Seymour in 1861; in 1862 he put down some six or seven, in 1863 some twenty, and in 1864 eleven,—making in all thirty-four or thirty-five wells in public use from two to five years before Green's application was filed, besides others put down by Suggett. All this was fully shown by the testimony filed in the Patent Office, so that the office was well aware of that fact.

Up to that time, however, it had always been held that the public use must have been without the knowledge or consent of the inventor or applicant, in order to work a forfeiture of